lain base which is to receive his artistic decoration. In fact, he has discovered some new combinations, which greatly extend the range and application of the products of the fictile art.

Mr. Hammersley, the master of the Nottingham School of Design, may be mentioned as an example of the value of industrial education to an artist of design. He was originally a designer for the potteries; and as he resided on the spot, he had at once to apply his patterns to the products. It was on this practical and mechanical knowledge that he raised the superstructure of his art; and he has profited by experience; for on his appointment to Nottingham, he set himself to study the nature and principles of lace manufacture, without a knowledge of which it would be impossible for him to discover how art could be applied to the fabric.

In art proper, England is decidedly superior to France. No one could entertain a doubt on the subject who compared the last year's exhibition in Trafalgar-square, with the melancholy acres of painted canvas displayed about the same time at the Louvre. It is not improbable that our designers would come very near those of France *on paper;* but most assuredly the French would produce ten workable and working patterns for our one.

Even viewed artistically, there are some obvious and essential differences between a design and a painting. A painting is designed to suggest,—a pattern to produce direct impression; a painting may be allowed to gain upon you and grow upon you,—a pattern, unless it strikes at once, is an absolute failure. Design, therefore, is necessarily dramatic; and hence the histrionic character, which is the great defect in the French school of painting, is the great merit of their school of design.

So long as the school in Somerset-house is confined to artistic instruction, it is not a school of design, but a school of low art,—a place for training candidates for rejection by the Royal Academy. Artists ought to have a share, and a very important one, in the training of designers; but they neither can nor will give them the kind of instruction most essential to their success, and that is, a knowledge of the elements from which design must be framed, and of the means by which it is to be realized.

It is certainly of importance that taste should be cultivated in the designer, but not until the powers which combine to form taste have been developed and rightly directed. Give the designer the industrial portion of his education, and then let him have as much of the highest art as he has either capacity or opportunity for receiving. Design differs from high art not merely in degree, but *in kind;* for design includes *contrivance*, with which art has nothing whatever to do. A beautiful picture would be a very bad pattern, in ninety-nine cases out of the hundred.

A designer has to invent; and the power of inventing requires that the *mental faculties* should be developed by *general knowledge*. It needs not to dwell an instant longer on so palpable a truth.

A school of design then is a school of arts and manufactures; not a school of art, in the singular number, without any reference to manufactures, singular or plural. Design is properly a part of industrial education; but severed from industry, it is nothing more than

Extinctæ corpus inutile destrue.

If it be desirable to have a school of design distinct from the school of arts and manufactures—which I do not deny—it should only be open to those who had completed their industrial courses, and manifested such a taste for design as might seem worthy of further development and cultivation. For such students, one room set apart in the general school would probably be found amply sufficient.

I have stated my opinions at greater length than I intended; they are the results of observation and experience in the factories and workshops, as well as the schools, of England and France. The schools of England err fundamentally; they are based on the supposition that design is a lower grade of art. I contend that design is a very different thing from any of what are called the fine arts; and I point out the important element of difference in the one comprehensive word *contrivance*. I grant that some knowledge of the fine arts is an element of design, and I am as anxious as any one can be to make that element as perfect as possible. But still, such knowledge is only one element out of many: I doubt whether it is an element which ought to predominate; and I am very certain that it cannot safely be allowed to exclude all the rest.

It would be absurd in me to recommend amendments and improvements, when my objections apply to an entire system. I want to see schools of arts and manufactures in which design shall form an essential part of the course of instruction. I desire to see these schools under the joint government of the Board of Trade, the Council of Education, and local authorities, except the central school, which ought to be placed directly under the Government, without the intervention of any irresponsible council or committee. Each school of design now existing in the country affords a nucleus for a school of arts and manufactures, without disturbing any body, or displacing any body. Retain all your paid staff; you will want every one of them: get rid of the *unpaid;* for no economic aphorism is more true than this, 'Whatever Government gets done for nothing, is generally very dear at the price.' Do not contemptuously neglect, or affect to despise, mechanical details and commercial considerations, in discussing the matter. St. Paul's advice had a wider scope than religion, when he said, 'Despise not the day of small things.' In devising schemes for the improvement of design, let not the artizan be forgotten in the artist—you may be assured that a good bricklayer has a greater national, and a greater market value, than a bad painter.

W. Cooke Taylor."

THE CONSTRUCTIVE SCIENCES AT KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON.

In King's College, as at the London University, the classes for the study of the arts of construction and architecture, under Professor Hosking, are making satisfactory progress. The course of instruction now pursued there is this:—At the October commencement, the professor introduces the subject of construction generally to students of all years; and throughout the term so commenced the assistant professor, Mr. A. Moseley, teaches the simpler elements to those of the students who are in their second and third years, and concludes by an examination, the result of which enables the professor to judge what information the students have acquired during that term. In the terms from Christmas to Midsummer, Mr. Moseley confines himself to surveying and estimating, and Professor Hosking goes through the subject of the arts of construction in connection with civil engineering and architecture generally, to the same second and third years' men; and at the conclusion, that is, in the last week in June, examines the third year's men upon the whole subject, and awards a prize to that student who gives the best answers to the inquiries. Those students who return for the third year have thus the whole course twice over, and alone come up for final examination.

At the last examination, the prize was awarded to Mr. Nunn.

TEA-GARDEN ARCHITECTURE.

A "Young Architect" has addressed a letter to us, setting forth how that he and other students, flighty rogues, were led, by a flowery description in a morning newspaper, of a beautiful gothic hall, erected as a refreshment-room in a popular place of resort a short distance from London, to travel there at certain cost in time and money. And further, how that when they reached the *locus in quo*, it turned out to be a "a flimsy, vulgar, unsubstantial affair, as little like the hall at Eltham, to which the said morning paper had gravely compared it, as the station of the Great Western Railway at Paddington is to St. Paul's." He continues, "I will briefly mention what I saw:—A large low structure, with a very flat roof, perforated with skylights; two large doors at either end; the roof supported by two rows of short slight wooden pillars; against these were affixed thin pieces of mirrors, at the end of which were boards cut into a curved shape, with mouldings and paintings on them; the windows in the walls were few, and those not Gothic; no louvre, no fine old gallery or screen; no oriels; nothing, in short, belonging to antiquity."

Although scarcely worth mentioning, and his statement satisfies us he must be a very "young architect" to expect any thing better, we notice his objection because we agree with him in this, that praise of such a structure, on such grounds, by a respectable journal, while it is an evidence of the want of architectural knowledge generally, is calculated to do injury, and should be reprobated. We propose peeping at one or two places of public resort, which make claim for architectural decorations, before long.

THE STATUE OF HER MAJESTY,
BY GIBSON.

THE NEW CROWN PIECE,
BY WYON.

These two novel works of art have been much praised by periodical critics; but they have not been fairly and properly reviewed, as regards their historical and national import. Let us briefly notice them with reference to their truthfulness, and to the effects they are calculated to make on the mind of the rising generation of artists, and of future historians and critics. If the *Statue of Victoria* was exhibited in any museum or gallery of Europe, without an inscription, or explanation, could any spectator fancy it to be a portraiture of the present amiable Queen of England. Was she ever seen, or is she likely to be seen, clothed in such amplitude of mantle,—with such sandals,—with such a tiara on the head, and such wreath and scroll in her hands? If not, what can justify the artist to chisel such things in marble, as part and parcel of the statue of a female, and affix the name, Victoria Regina, to the mass?

If the biographer or historian were to describe our most gracious Queen, as appearing at court, in the senate, or on horseback, in such costume, would the account be tolerated? Would it not seem like caricature? and would not the writer be reprobated and condemned, as faithless and false; as indicating an imaginary rather than a real personage? Besides, we know that the Greeks, in making their famed statues, busts, bassi-relievi, &c., copied and rendered permanent the portraitures of their emperors, senators, heroes, and females, not merely in personal features, but in costume and all other accessories. They did not clothe an Alexander, or a Pericles, in the dress of the Egyptians, but in that of the age in which they respectively lived. The Roman artists did the same, whence the best works of both nations are justly regarded as authorities, as historical data, for description and criticism. We are also in the habit of referring to the sculptures, the paintings, the medals, and coins of the middle ages, as guides and evidences for costume, implements, weapons, and other personal details; but if artists are tolerated and *encouraged* to produce statues and pictures of illustrious and eminent British personages of the nineteenth century, in the habits, &c., of the Egyptians, the Greeks, or the Romans, who lived centuries ago, we shall lose all identity of persons, time, and of authenticity.

The late Mr. West set a most praiseworthy example in historical pictures, as Chantrey did in sculpture, of an earnest and laudable endeavour to make art both historical and biographical, and thus calculated to represent the hero, the statesman, the philosopher, the poet, &c., in a dress which truly belonged to him, in a costume which seemed to mark the age and country in which either of those personages lived, and which would at once contra-distinguish him or her from another person of a distinct age and remote nation. These sentiments were often reiterated in my ears by the two eminent artists alluded to, and were, and are, so indelibly impressed on my mind that they can never be effaced,—nor can any fascination of art reconcile me to approve and admire a work that is opposed to the principle. In making these remarks on *Gibson's* fine and, as it may be called, classical statue, I do not wish to depreciate it as a work of high art, of great beauty, of eminent talent; but I must enter an unqualified protest against its being called and regarded as a portraiture of the illustrious, exemplary, and estimable living female monarch of Great Britain.

for a comprehensive guide on PDF Compression and OCR go to ThePaperlessOffice.org